DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 045 EC 302 617

AUTHOR Baker-Shenk, Charlotte
TITLE Developing and Evaluating Graduate-Level Curricula for Teachers of American Sign Language and ASL/English Interpreting: Final Grant Report.
INSTITUTION Western Maryland Coll., Westminster.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 30 Jun 91
CONTRACT G008730447
NOTE 13p.
AVAILABLE FROM Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc., 8719 Colesville Rd., #310, Silver Spring, MD 20910 (model curriculum: $38.95 plus shipping).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Sign Language; *Curriculum Development; *Deaf Interpreting; *Deafness; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Program Development; Program Termination; *Teacher Education; Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS *Western Maryland College

ABSTRACT

This final report describes activities of a 4-year (1987-91) project at Western Maryland College to develop an 11-course graduate curriculum for teachers of American Sign Language (ASL) and teachers of ASL/English Interpreting. The curriculum formed the basis for two graduate programs at Western Maryland College. The project also developed six videotapes. Accessibility of the curriculum in ASL was stressed, as many of the programs' students are deaf. The report describes the project's purpose (stemming from the lack of any other such programs), background and origins, program site selection, program site difficulties (leading to the planned termination of the programs at this site), and project results. Appendix 2, which is the curriculum itself: "A Model Curriculum for Teachers of American Sign Language and Teachers of ASL/English Interpreting," was copyrighted in 1990 and is not included here. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 364 045

Developing and Evaluating Graduate-Level Curricula for Teachers of American Sign Language and ASL/English Interpreting

FINAL GRANT REPORT

Cover Sheet

Grantee Organization:

Western Maryland College
Westminster, MD 21157

Grant Number:

G008730447

Project Dates:

Starting Date: September 1, 1987
Ending Date: June 30, 1991
Number of Months: 36 + 12 (Dissemination grant)

Project Director:

Charlotte Baker-Shenk
2421 Perry Street, NE
Washington, DC 20018
Telephone: (202) 529-6475

FIPSE Program Award Officers: Diana Hayman & Jaymie Lewis

Grant Award:		
	Year 1	$24,237
	Year 2	$37,177
	Year 3	$16,854
	Year 4	$ 7,360
	TOTAL	$85,628

EC 302617

Summary

Experts in the fields of spoken and signed language teaching and interpretation worked together to develop an 11-course, state-of-the-art curriculum for teachers of American Sign Language (ASL) and teachers of ASL/English Interpreting. This curriculum forms the basis for two unique and highly innovative graduate programs for these two populations of teachers at Western Maryland College. During the project period, curriculum developers engaged in several revision cycles based on extensive feedback of their work from ongoing evaluations of other professionals, practitioners, and current students in the programs. Materials were developed to supplement the curriculum, including six ASL videotapes. Since the majority of students in the Teaching American Sign Language program are Deaf, serious efforts were made to make information accessible in ASL.

Project Director:
Charlotte Baker-Shenk, Ph.D.
2421 Perry Street, NE
Washington, DC 20018
(202) 529-6475

Project Products

A Model Curriculum for Teachers of American Sign Language and Teachers of ASL/English Interpreting (1990), C. Baker-Shenk (Ed.). Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.

Videotapes

Introduction to Linguistic Analysis: Preparation Video.
Second Language Teaching Methodology: Readings.
Longitudinal Student Sign Samples.
Cross-Sectional Student Sign Samples.
The Translation Process: English to ASL.
Conflict Resolution in the Deaf Community.

Project Title: Developing and Evaluating Graduate-level Curricula for Teachers of American Sign Language and ASL/English Interpreting

Grantee: Western Maryland College, Westminster, MD 21157

Project Director: Charlotte Baker-Shenk (202) 529-6475; (301) 699-1597

FINAL GRANT REPORT

Project Overview

We developed a carefully evaluated and very detailed graduate-level curriculum for teachers of American Sign Language (ASL) and teachers of ASL/English Interpreting. This unique curriculum and the materials developed to supplement its implementation are now transportable to any post-secondary institution that can supply qualified instructors to teach the courses. The two teacher preparation programs at Western Maryland College which now follow this curriculum are four years in length (33 credit hours) and are offered only during the summer in order to accommodate the needs of practicing teachers. The College graduated their first class in the summer of 1991 (receiving M.S. degrees).

It is no exaggeration to say that students in these programs have been overwhelmingly enthusiastic and grateful for their unique educational opportunity. Clearly, they have found this experience empowering in at least three basic ways: active participation in their program has enabled them to develop the skills and knowledge base for functioning competently as a teacher; they have become recognized as leaders in their respective fields; and perhaps, most importantly, because of the learner-centered, dialogic methods assumed by the curriculum, students have learned a way to continue learning.

Unfortunately, Western Maryland College (WMC) did not turn out to be a suitable location for these programs. In short, having "big city" professionals suddenly show up in the summer to teach very intensive courses with high demands on highly motivated students was not well received by this small-town college, especially since the college was not able to provide the necessary administrative and public relations support. In addition, the progressive attitudes of our program faculty and students about Deaf people and their language and culture was threatening to the faculty of WMC's long-standing graduate program in Deaf Education. The final blow came in the summer of 1991 when the whole college was given notice of major state-wide financial cutbacks, and the college-hired program administrator made several serious errors in hiring and fiscal management. As a result, program faculty are now in the process of negotiating with other possible sites for these programs.

Purpose

This project addressed the serious problem that NONE of the approximately 3,500 teachers who currently teach ASL or teach ASL/English interpreting at the post-secondary level hold a graduate degree in their area of teaching. In fact, very few have received any formal academic training directly relevant to their work as teachers. (The majority do hold undergraduate degrees but these are in fields not related to ASL, interpreting, or second language teaching.) Other than short, periodic workshops, there has been no place for teachers to go who want to improve their skills and knowledge.

As a result, there has been a great variability in the performance of these teachers and the subsequent learning of their students. Furthermore, the lack of academic stature of these

teachers has relegated them to the lowest ends of pay salaries and job security. Another problem has been "handicappist" attitudes which give second class status to any profession associated with Deaf people, especially to professions directly linked to the language and culture of Deaf people. Teachers' lack of academic pedigree has only exacerbated that problem.

We sought to develop a graduate program for teachers of ASL and a graduate program for teachers of ASL/English interpreting. With the cart before the horse, we gained approval from Western Maryland College and the state of Maryland to begin offering courses before we had a curriculum in place. Funds from FIPSE provided the means to develop the needed curriculum and, thus begin to offer teachers a way to improve their skills and join the academic community on better footing.

Background and Origins

The vision for this whole project began several years before contacting FIPSE. Three Deaf leaders in the field of teaching ASL and three hearing professionals (including two of the top interpreters and teachers of interpreting in the country) began meeting regularly to discuss what to do about the notoriously poor skills of students in (supposedly) ASL classes and of those working as interpreters in the U.S.. They also noted the wide gap between the knowledge now available from research on ASL, Deaf culture, and ASL/English interpretation and those who had access to that information.

During those discussions, it became clear that one major way to improve that situation was teacher education --i.e develop credible programs for teachers of ASL and ASL/English interpreting so that the thousands of students annually taking ASL course and enrolling in interpreter preparation programs could receive a better education, assuming their teachers had participated in these new programs. So the group began to brainstorm the kinds of courses that such programs could offer and possible sites for the programs.

Later, three members of that original six began negotiations with Western Maryland College (WMC), and one of them (later project director of the FIPSE grant) became the first coordinator of the programs while the other two served as core faculty. They began offering the most "tantalizing" courses to begin to draw in students. Several of these courses were later evaluated as NOT first-level courses and students who entered the full-blown programs had to be shuffled around to remedy the original error in course sequencing.

Now in the position of having a site for the programs with a makeshift curriculum approved, the originators knew they needed more serious work on the curriculum (work they knew the college would not fund). FIPSE offered that support.

Program Site Selection. Why did we, the originators, select Western Maryland College (WMC) as the site for these programs? We chose WMC because: it already had expressed an interest in Deaf people (i.e. had a long-standing Deaf Education program); the Director of the Deaf Ed program (himself the son of Deaf parents) was interested in working with us; the per credit hour cost of courses was lower than several other potential sites in the Washington, DC area (where four of our key personnel are located); we thought a small college would have fewer hoops and less red tape to work through and would offer us greater freedom to assemble the kind of programs we wanted to develop; and because we were able to persuade a few key WMC faculty of the need for these two teacher education programs and that, among us, we had the expertise to pull together the needed curriculum and offer the courses.

Program Site Difficulties. In retrospect, selecting a college that already had a Deaf education program was probably unwise -- since historically the basic tenets and operational structure of Deaf Ed programs are antagonistic to our own. For example, historically, Deaf Ed programs are run by hearing people who have minimal or no skills in the language of Deaf people (ASL). Certification of Deaf Ed teachers does not even require ASL skills (!). We thought that the Director's own interest in being innovative and his expressed support for ASL meant we would be better able to work through such hostilities and, in fact, forge a mutually beneficial sharing with the Deaf Ed program. This did not happen. It also became clear that many campuswide staff held negative attitudes toward Deaf people -- which made life intolerable for empowered Deaf faculty and students in our programs who were working and learning in an already intense situation. The Afro-American instructor in our programs also expressed major concerns about how campus personnel treated her. The fact that the three persons most involved in developing and coordinating these programs were women also made interactions with some WMC personnel more difficult.

The context of our work, in general, supported development and evaluation of the program curriculum but did not support successful long-term implementation of the curriculum. It did not work to have "big city" "outsiders" rush in every summer for intensive courses with university-based expectations for support services such as access to computers, copying, lengthy library hours and reliable media support. It also did not work to have graduate students engaged in very demanding courses be awakened in the wee hours of the morning by kids doing drill parades or finding themselves needing to skip lunch rather than stand in long cafeteria lines behind scores of would-be football players, etc. (The college is in the process of determining its priority for academic programs in the summer versus other better money-making programs.)

WMC did not provide us with the needed administrative and public relations support. Calls from prospective students went unanswered, the files of returning students as well as some materials purchased to supplement the curriculum were lost, and students often arrived on campus never having received confirmation that they were even accepted into the courses and had housing. Little effort was made to advertise the availability of these programs nor were they publicized in positive ways on campus by those who had regular positions during the year. No one on campus ever took ownership for the programs nor helped us learn the ropes about campus expectations. We had several major meetings with college administrators (there have been two different deans and three different directors in the past 5 years) to try to remedy these problems and to communicate directly and exactly what our program needs were but only some of the needed changes were implemented.

We thought things would finally work out when WMC, in August 1990, hired a new director for the Center on Deafness (which houses the Deaf Ed program as well as our teacher education programs). This new director was a visionary man with a commitment to correcting past mistakes, encouraging positive dialogue with campus personnel, and taking ownership of the programs. Unfortunately, he made numerous, serious financial and hiring errors in the summer of 1991 -- which led to his termination at WMC and further souring of the relationship between our programs and the WMC campus.

During the fall of 1991, another new administrator (David Seligman, Vice President for Academic Affairs) initiated an evaluation of the programs. During conversations with the Project Director, he expressed his regret that things had gotten so bad and his opinion that, unless major peace-making efforts were undertaken in the form of a new director with vision and skills, it would not be possible to continue the programs at WMC. The Project Director agreed with this summary, recognizing with regret that our program personnel (including students) also were quite alienated by their associations with WMC. When state-

wide financial cutbacks foreclosed the possibility of hiring such a new director, the decision to terminate the programs at WMC was clear. WMC will continue to run the programs for students currently enrolled (i.e. for the next 3 years of the 4-year programs) but will not admit any new students beginning in 1992. [See attached Seligman letter dated January 6, 1992]

Looking back, it seems clear that WMC's lack of ownership of the programs was a determining factor in the unsuccessful long-term implementation of the curriculum. We made several errors that exacerbated this problem. First, we had originally asked the first director of the Center on Deafness to be the Project Director (PD) of the grant, thinking that this would better ensure his and WMC's support. (The "working" PD was labeled Project Coordinator.) FIPSE then asked that both become co-PDs, and this change was made in the grant proposal. However, the "working" PD did very little to keep the WMC PD informed of what was happening on the grant substantively, other than having him keep the financial records. Second, we did not initiate efforts during the year to communicate directly with significant campus personnel about the goals and benefits of these programs. Although clearly the WMC director should have acted as a bridge, we, too should have foreseen the ways that local campus folks would respond ("Why is the administration supporting this program and letting them cut corners when my program is being cut and I have to jump through all these hoops?"). Most certainly, we should have foreseen the defensive response of faculty in the Deaf Ed program and have initiated bridge-building dialogue and activities of mutual benefit. Unfortunately, we were living one and one-half hours away on hectic schedules and did not make time to initiate these exchanges. We did request that such dialogues be initiated by the local WMC directors but, perhaps for a variety of reasons, they did not do so. **We feel that this lack of WMC ownership was not a <u>necessary</u> artifact of having off-campus program leadership. However, our lack of forethought and planning <u>on this issue</u> significantly hindered support for the programs on campus. As we begin negotiations with other prospective sites, we will definitely make major efforts not to repeat this error.

Project Description

With three-year funding from FIPSE, we pulled together nationally recognized leaders in the fields of ASL teaching and the teaching of ASL/English interpreting to work collaboratively to develop a state-of-the-art curriculum for the two new, graduate programs for these teacher populations and to serve as faculty in those programs. We also built into that development a major evaluation component: as courses were developed and offered, extensive student feedback was sought and then revisions were made based on that feedback; professional consultants in the fields of spoken language teaching and interpretation as well as consultants in signed language-related fields were hired to review and evaluate the curriculum; large numbers of practicing teachers reviewed an earlier draft of the curriculum and met together to offer their ideas and suggestions. Course writers also frequently consulted with each other about problems and ways to improve the curriculum.

During the final years of the grant (3 years, plus 1 year added dissemination work), we also focused on developing materials to support the curriculum. Most of these materials were videotapes which we had to produce in conjunction with companies specializing in sign language-related materials. We also constructed showcase exhibits publicizing the curriculum and the programs. These exhibits have been shown at 23 professional meetings/conventions. Writers of the curriculum have presented papers and workshops at a variety of national and international conferences to describe its components and begin to develop a standard for the kinds of skills, knowledge, and attitudes needed by teachers of ASL and ASL/English interpreting.

Aware that the graduate curriculum for teachers of interpretation is unique worldwide, we sent flyers describing it to members of the CIUTI (Ecoles de Traduction et d'Interpretation / translation and interpreting schools) and officers of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC). We also sent free copies of the published curriculum to internationally recognized teachers of interpretation.

Project Results

We now have a published, detailed curriculum for the two teachers programs that can be transported to any post-secondary institution that can supply qualified instructors to teach the courses. We also have 6 new videotapes produced to supplement the curriculum as well as a variety of other written materials. There presently are students at each level of both programs (Year 1, Year 2, Year 3) enrolled (i.e. a total of six separate classes of students), and we just completed the cycle, graduating in 1991 (Year 4 students) the first class of students in the Teaching Interpreting program.

Most importantly, we have found that students in these programs are blossoming as leaders in their fields. Already we and they are receiving requests for graduates (and even those with only two years in the program!) to accept jobs in responsible, professional positions. Students in the 1991 graduating class received a standing ovation and commendations at the 1991 Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf (RID) national convention. Continuing students and graduating students have formed networks among themselves to continue dialogue, the sharing/digesting of information, and to work creatively to produce materials and models of their own.

There is such enthusiasm among the students! As stated in the Project Overview, the students have experienced genuine empowerment. They freely engage in challenging dialogue with their former instructors with a kind of facility and self-confidence that many of us wish we had! (We wish we had had the benefit of this kind of Freirian approach to education focused on areas of knowledge that we all learned in much less freeing and creative ways.)

Significantly, the Teaching ASL program has been fully accessible to Deaf graduate students, who have been able to learn in their own language with strategies sensitive to their culture. Having access to indepth information about their own language and culture is unusual for Deaf students. So is having competent ASL-using instructors or interpreters. Most of their educational experiences have been with hearing instructors who were not only unskilled in ASL but frequently both monolingual and mono-cultural. To be able to learn in such a supportive and accessible environment has been life-changing for many Deaf students. One testimony to this fact is that despite the lack of advertising about the programs and our (incorrect) expectation that numbers in the Teaching ASL classes might be small because Deaf people (our target students for the Teaching ASL program) may not yet value higher education, the classes have become full during the past few years. There is such a hungering for this kind of educational experience. Now other programs (e.g. grant-funded California State program for training legal interpreters) are beginning to consult with us about how we have handled problems related to making the program truly accessible to Deaf students.

As stated in other sections of this report, the site we selected for these programs was not suitable to our needs. We are presently looking for a better site (hopefully in the Washington, DC immediate area) and are confident of our ability to find one.

Summary and Conclusions

The evaluation component of our work led to several major changes in program content and sequencing as well as clarified our need to develop certain materials to support specific courses. In particular, there was a need for videotaped material in ASL to enable better access to information for Deaf students in the teaching ASL program. The only substantive critique of the final curriculum--that it is designed to support intensive three-week courses--remains unresolved. There is disagreement among both faculty and students about how well students can process the course material in such short, intense periods.

This format was chosen out of a concern for practicing teachers (many with families) who could not afford to take a year or two off for schooling. On the positive side, we have tried to modify courses such that several now require students to continue their own process of reflection on course material during the academic year in their own classrooms and return for follow-up evaluation at the beginning of the next summer. However, the reality is that students enter the program with very little preparation for what they will encounter (it is very different from their past experience of education and their present working situations), and they return home each year to environments that offer little support.

If today we could re-structure the program and curriculum (which we hope to in its new location) and if we had the necessary qualified personnel to broaden course offerings (which we probably will have in a few more years), we would offer the programs during the regular academic year as well as during the summer. Furthermore, we would build in a regular "teaching" component to several courses throughout the curriculum rather than wait until the last year for an intensive teaching practicum. The Year 4 practicum of graduating students in 1991 showed us that although they are clearly leaving the program with the needed "head" knowledge and learning skills, many need more development of personal strategies for using what they have learned in their own classrooms. This was especially true for those students who were not practicing teachers during the four years of their coursework.

Some other problems: administratively, it was difficult to run herd on the curriculum development work of highly sought-after professionals with pressure-cooker schedules. Working with "the best" added many headaches although the resultant quality was worth it. Another related problem was the diversity of style and content of each writer despite their having received a fairly detailed description of expectations. Academic freedom is wonderful except when trying to develop a fairly uniform product --was this attempt at uniformity a mistake? In any case, the subsequent diversity demanded much more time from the editor/organizer than originally anticipated.

We were also disappointed in the feedback received from several consultants; it was largely editorial rather than substantive. Were they intimidated by the stature of the curriculum writers? Was it a mistake to ask for editorial as well as content/structure feedback? Perhaps it would have been better to separate out those asked only for substantive critique so they could not have avoided that task by focusing on minor details.

Another disappointment was the lack of response to our mailing to the Ecoles de Traduction et d'Interpretation (translation and interpreting schools) and officers of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC). We suspect that since our Teaching Interpreting curriculum focuses on the non-spoken language (ASL) of a non-prestige people (Deaf), the international (spoken language) interpreting community did not understand the relevance to their own work -- despite the fact that this is the only graduate-level curriculum for interpreter educators in the world! (Our field, in some ways, has gone beyond that of spoken language interpretation, since we have had opportunity to learn from their mistakes.) Only those international interpreter educators (e.g. Danica Seleskovitch and Etilvia Arjona-Chang) who already were familiar with our field appreciated the significance

of the curriculum and programs. On the other hand, interpreter educators working with signed languages in other countries were quick to pick up on this new resource, many purchasing copies of the curriculum and some coming to the U.S. to attend classes.

Appendices

Notes to FIPSE.

A Model Curriculum for Teachers of American Sign Language and Teachers of ASL/English Interpreting (1990). C. Baker-Shenk (Ed.). Silver Spring, MD: RID Publications.

Flyer advertising curriculum publication.

Letter dated 6 January 1992 from D. Seligman (WMC).

Project Title: Developing and Evaluating Graduate-level Curricula for Teachers of American Sign Language and ASL/English Interpreting

Grantee: Western Maryland College, Westminster, MD 21157

Project Director: Charlotte Baker-Shenk (202) 529-6475; (301) 699-1597

Notes to FIPSE

Forms of assistance helpful to us: (1) the process of receiving feedback on our preliminary proposal and then revising it to become our final proposal resulted in significant improvements (including revising our quite unrealistically low budget); (2) the kinds of questions raised in the proposal guide encouraged us to think in those learner-centered and evaluation-sensitive ways -- the guide in itself was a helpful teaching tool; (3) Diana Hayman's visit to the College enhanced our program prestige and also gave us time to learn from the variety of resources she could offer us; (4) the year-end continuation proposals, while a dreaded ordeal, did provide us with a clear vehicle for monitoring our progress and helped us keep certain key questions in mind as we entered each new phase; (5) the annual meetings were wonderfully stimulating and fostered a needed sense of "community" (as opposed to isolation) among innovative educators.

How can FIPSE work more effectively with other projects: (1) obviously changing Program Officers after the first year was disruptive, especially since the new Officer needed time to learn the ropes before being able to respond consistently to questions of protocol. Several times, I received one answer from a Program Officer and a different one from the Finance Office. Frustrating; (2) repeatedly, I found it difficult to reach by phone either my Program Officer or other needed personnel; (3) I would have found helpful a session on grant budgetary management since this was my first experience of needing to handle this end. I had many questions about how to handle the budget with continuation proposals and did not find the materials sent to me sufficiently clear (and my phone conversations resulted in me spending hours organizing the numbers one way and then later being told to do it a different way); (4) I struggled with the format of the Final Grant Report - my head apparently organizes things quite differently! For example, I don't understand the rationale for describing "administrative pitfalls" or what I have learned about the problem addressed in a "PURPOSE" section. Sometimes it seemed like too many disparate questions under the same heading.

Future proposals in this area? Emerging new directions: One area terribly in need of innovative thinking, curriculum development, and evaluation is Deaf Education. Post-secondary institutions across the country are still churning out graduates with little or no exposure to the language and culture of Deaf people and a lot of handicappist assumptions and "tools" for working with Deaf children. Programs are still primarily geared to teaching hearing people how to teach Deaf people and have not developed ways to become accessible to Deaf would-be teachers. To my knowledge, there are no credible Deaf Ed programs in the U.S.

Another area badly needing somebody with the necessary skills to do the work is the diagnostic evaluation of ASL skills. Our curriculum helps teachers learn how to evaluate their students' skills and provide feedback, but there exists no standard test to accomplish this. The Vista College ASL curriculum, also FIPSE-funded, helps students develop ASL skills but there is no external measure to see how students in this system compare with others using different methods and materials.

Other comments: Thanks for your support. I wish some of you could sit in on classes in our programs or talk with students who have graduated. To see how "turned on" to learning they are and the kind of hope they are bringing to the fields of ASL teaching and interpretation -- would probably do your overworked hearts and bodies some good indeed! Do feel free to consider a visit someday. I'd be happy to arrange it!

NEW! FROM RID PUBLICATIONS

A Model Curriculum for Teachers of American Sign Language and Teachers of ASL/English Interpreting
Dr. Charlotte Baker-Shenk, Editor

"I have never come across such a complete and extensive curriculum design before."
- Dr. Sylvia Lambert, Director of School of Translators and Interpreters, University of Ottawa

"Ambitious, rich, impressive synthesis of enormous amounts of material..."
- Dr. JoAnne Crandall, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington D.C.

"Excellent program; its strengths include its very existence, its philosophy, thoroughness, resource list, and state-of-the-art content." - feedback session with 15 practicing ASL teachers

The nation's first two graduate programs to prepare ASL teachers and teachers of ASL/English interpreting are contained in a single publication which includes 13 detailed course curricula. Units in each course specify student and teacher resources, learning activities, assessment strategies and more. The courses are:

Applied Research in the Classroom
Assessing Student ASL Skills
Assessing Students in Interpreter Preparation Programs
Contrastive Cultural Analysis: Deaf and Hearing
Contrastive Linguistic Analysis: ASL and English
Curriculum Theory and Design for ASL Instruction and Interpreter Education
Issues in Interpreter Education
Linguistic Structure of American Sign Language
Second Language Teaching Methodology
Second Language Acquisition and ASL Instruction
Sociology of the Community
Teaching American Deaf Culture
Teaching the Interpreting Process

Contributors to the curriculum include MJ Bienvenu, Dr. Dennis Cokely, Betty Colonomos, Dr. Janice Kanda, Dr. Jamila Kizuwanda, and Dr. James Lantolf.

** Pre-publication price: $32.95 ** After August 15, 1990: $38.95 **
Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. 8719 Colesville Rd. Suite 310 Silver Spring, MD 20910

Yes! Please send me *A Model Curriculum for Teachers of American Sign Language and Teachers of ASL/English Interpreting*. I understand that the cost of each copy is $32.95 if order is postmarked on or before August 15, 1990, and $38.95 if order is postmarked after August 15, 1990. Shipping/handling charges are $4.00 for the first copy and $2.00 for every additional copy. Please add 4% if purchasing by credit card.

Number of copies		Price per book		Total		Shipping		Credit Card Charge (If applicable)		Total Due
_____	X	_____	=	_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____

Name_____ Street Address_____

City_____ State_____ Zip_____

Credit Card Information (Please add 4% to total above) VISA or MASTERCARD

Card #_____ Exp. Date_____

Signature_____ Date_____

Registry of Interpreters for the Deaf, Inc. 8719 Colesville Rd. # 310 Silver Spring, MD 20910. (301) 608-0050

WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE

Westminster, Maryland 21157
(301) 848-7000 or 876-2055

VICE PRESIDENT-DEAN OF
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

January 6, 1992

TO: Dr. Helen Wolfe
Graduate Dean

FROM: David Seligman
Vice President for Academic Affairs

RE: TIP and TAP Programs

Based upon my analysis of TIP and TAP Programs, including budget history, surveys of faculty, administrators, staff, and students, and discussions with several authorities in the field of deaf education, I have concluded that it is necessary to begin the process of severing the relationship between Western Maryland College and the TIP and TAP programs.

I come to this decision with considerable regret, since it has become clear to me that these are cutting edge programs of considerable social and educational significance. Nevertheless, in the current difficult budgetary circumstances, the College finds itself examining the need to eliminate programs and personnel in every area. The historic difficulties these programs have had in interacting positively with other elements of the College, and our inability to provide the staffing and leadership necessary to bring about the needed improvements in the programs, make the termination of the TIP and TAP programs a virtual necessity.

While Western Maryland College recognizes its obligation to students currently enrolled in the programs and is committed to providing them the opportunity to complete their studies, I am herewith instructing the Office of Graduate Programs not to admit any new students into the program for the Summer of 1992 and until further notice. Please let me know what steps you will be taking to ensure that adequate notice of this decision reaches those who must have this information.

cc: M.J. Bienvenu
Betty Colonomos
Charlotte Baker-Shenk

Note of Explanation:
TIP = Teaching Interpreting Program
TAP = Teaching ASL Program